

12 Bullant
Nov 1972

ACCADEMIA NAZIONALE DEI LINCEI

ANNO CCCLXIII - 1966

QUADERNO N. 76

**PROBLEMI ATTUALI
DI SCIENZA E DI CULTURA**

ATTI DEL CONVEGNO SUL TEMA:

LA PERSIA E IL MONDO GRECO-ROMANO

(Roma 11-14 aprile 1965)



ROMA
ACCADEMIA NAZIONALE DEI LINCEI

1966

II SEDUTA

12 aprile 1965 — ore 10

Presiede il prof. B. G. Gafurov.

ELIAS BICKERMAN

THE SELEUCIDS AND THE ACHAEMENIDS

SUMMARY. — Starting from the question of Machiavelli, why the kingdom of Darius did not rebel against the Macedonian rule after Alexander's death, the author emphasizes the distinction between Iran proper and the outer Iran and the fact that the anti-Seleucid rebellions in outer Iran were organized by Hellenes. He describes the situation of the natives under the Seleucid rule, the importance of the northern frontier which protected Iran against the nomads, and deals with the problems of Hellenization and Iranization with particular reference to Soviet excavations in outer Iran.

We have not lived ordinary human life. We are born to become a marvel to posterity. Is not the Persian King—who dug through Athos, who bridged the Hellespont, who demanded earth and water from the Greeks, who dared to write in his letters that he was master of all mankind, from the rising to the setting sun—is not he now struggling for the last, not for dominion over others, but for the rescue of himself? ⁽¹⁾

Spoken in Athens, in the summer of 330, when Alexander pursued Darius beyond the Caspian sea, these words of Aeschines have been echoed since by all historians of the Hellenistic Age. It is natural and just that we are on the side of the Hellenes who triumphed over the East. We all are Hellenes spiritually, whether born in Washington or Teheran, for we all are sons of "European" civilization; the real difference between the "Europeans" and the rest of the world was the work of the Greeks:

Ce sont les philosophes d'Athènes, de Milet, de Syracuse, d'Alexandrie, qui ont rendu les habitants de l'Europe actuelle supérieurs aux autres hommes. Si Xerxès eut vaincu à Salamine, nous serions peut-être encore de barbares ⁽²⁾.

(1) AESCHINES, III. 132.

(2) VOLTAIRE, *Commentaire sur l'Esprit des Loix* (1777); cf. *Du Climat*, XXIX, p. 408 of KEHL's edition. In the *Dictionnaire Philosophique* s.v. *Climat*, Voltaire observes: "Tout change dans les corps et les esprits avec le temps. Peut-être, un jour les Américains viendront enseigner les arts aux peuples de l'Europe".

Voltaire did not and could not know that the Islamic civilization which—from Bukhara to Cordoba—made the Moslems superior to the Christians of medieval Europe, was again the work of the same Greek philosophers. In Iran, the Islam was strongly affected by the late Persian civilization, itself molded by five centuries of Hellenism⁽³⁾. Islamic civilization hellenized those deep strata of the Orient which had eluded the Hellenic spirit in the age of Greek domination: that was Islam's historic role. Now Plato and Aristotle became the teachers of the East, and Christian Europe learned Aristotle, as commented by Averroes, from the Arabs.

Some Eastern authors today condemn Alexander's conquest; this anachronistic foolishness only shows the danger of nationalist infection, which may destroy backward nations⁽⁴⁾ more than small pox.

But there is no reason why an historian dealing with the Hellenistic period in the East should write as if he were a courtier of the Macedonian kings. Undue flattery, as the Greeks already noted⁽⁵⁾, has marred the works about Alexander. In this Symposium celebrating 2500 years of the Iranian monarchy, we should try to view Seleucid Iran not from the standpoint of the court at Antioch, but from that of a man in Susa: *Doctum ex omnibus solum neque in alienis locis peregrinum... sed in omni civitate esse civem*⁽⁶⁾.

Machiavelli asks:

Per qual cagione il regno di Dario, il quale da Alessandro fu occupato, non si rebello da' suoi successori dopo la morte di Alessandro⁽⁷⁾.

To answer this question, he distinguishes the centralized State which is governed *per principe e per servi* and the State which is ruled *per un principe e per baroni*. "El Turco" and "il re de Francia" exemplify for him these two kinds of State. It would be difficult to conquer *lo Stato del Turco* which is centralized, for the enemy can not be helped by internal dissension: *ma, vinto che sia, facilita grande e tenerlo... non resta alcuno di chi si abbia a temere, non avendo li altri credito con il popolo*⁽⁸⁾. France is easier to conquer since the enemy may count on the help of barons, but the conquest would not be secure: *ne ti basta spegnere el sangue del principe, perché vi rimangono quelli signori che si fanno capi delle nuove alterazioni*⁽⁹⁾. Machiavelli wrongly equated the Persian King of Kings and "El Turco". But his sociological analysis explains the essential fact in the history of Macedonian domination over

(3) V. G. LUKONIN, *Iran v Epochu Peruych Sasanidov* (1961), rightly stresses the Hellenistic character of the early Sassanian period.

(4) W. C. MAJMBAR, *The Age of Imperial Unity* (1951), calls Alexander a predecessor of Tamerlane, Taxila a traitor, and writes about Sandracotta's war of liberation.

(5) STRABO, XI. 508, 510; CICERO, *Pro Archia Poeta*, 10. 24.

(6) THEOPHRASTUS, *ap. Vitruv. de Archit.*, VI, Praef. 2.

(7) MACHIAVELLI, *Il Principe*, IV.

(8) *Ibid.*

(9) *Ibid.*

Persia: the different course of events in Iran proper (Persia and Media) and in Outer Iran.

After the decisive victory at Gaugamela on October 1, 331, Alexander —proclaimed King of Asia on the battlefield—could expect the whole empire of Darius to recognize the new "Lord of Asia" without hesitation. Decisive victory meant the transfer of power in Asia. Thus Alexander sealed his orders addressed to Asia with the signet of Darius. Babylon and Susa surrendered; Persia and Media were subdued without difficulty. At Ecbatana Alexander sent home his Thessalian cavalry and Greek allies, who returned "after having, with Alexander, destroyed Persian cities" ⁽¹⁰⁾

Afterward, the revolt of Bessus changed the situation. Alexander now had to spend three long and bloody years reducing Outer Iran, the northern satrapies of Darius. This region had been semi-independent under the Achaemenids. Except for the satrap and his entourage, there were probably no Persian officials ⁽¹¹⁾, and the army was recruited locally. The people obeyed their chieftains, and these "barons"—Bessus, Spitamenes, Oxyartes, Sisimithris etc.—refused to recognize Alexander ⁽¹²⁾. They regarded the end of the Achaemenids as the beginning of their own independence. Pointing to the military advantages of Bactria, Bessus called on the people to defend their freedom ⁽¹³⁾. Satibarzanes was among the champions of independence:

(10) PLUTARCH, *Alexander*, 34; the inscription of Lindos quoted by W. W. TARN, *Alexander the Great*, I (1948), p. 59; CURTIUS VI.6.6; ANTH. PAL., VI.344, probably a copy of a dedication of the Thespians in Alexander's service.

(11) *Istoria Tadzhikskogo Naroda*, ed. B. G. GAFUROV and B. A. LITVINSKI (1963), I, p. 209; cf. also V. M. MASSON, *Drevnezemledelcheskaia Kultura Margiany*, «MIA», no. 73 (1959), p. 149.

(12) Arrian calls these chieftains *hyparchoi*: lieutenant-governors. ARR., IV.1.6: the great rebellion against Alexander begins when he orders συναλθεῖν τοὺς ὑπάρχους τῆς χώρας ἐκείνης εἰς Ζαρίασσα IV.21.1: in the mountain castle of Chorienous αὐτὸς τε ὁ οὐκ ἠνέχθη συμπεφυῖται καὶ ἄλλοι τῶν ὑπάρχων οὐκ ὀλίγοι. These barons rule their territories. Cf. e.g. CURT., VIII.4.21: Alexander *pervenit in regionem cui Oxyartes, satrapes nobilis, preerat*. Their mountain castles, described by ARR., IV.21, CURT., VII.11.1, remind the historian of the castle belonging to the Tobiads in the mountains east of the Jordan—described by Josephus and now explored by archaeologists. Cf. P. W. LAPP, «Bulletin of the Amer. Schools of Oriental Research», no. 165 (1962), pp. 16 ff. These leaders have their own private troops of clients. On Alexander's arrival, the army of Bessus disintegrates (*in suos quisque vicus dilapsi, Bessum reliquerunt*), but he continues the fight *cum clientium manu qui non mutaverant fidem*. CURT., VII.4.21. Cf. ARR., IV.21.8: the *hetairoi* of Chorienus. Regarding military feudalism in the Persian Empire, cf. G. CARDASCIA, *Société Jean Bodin*, Recueil I (2nd ed. 1958), pp. 55 ff.

(13) DIOD., XVII.74.1. Modern authors modernize: TARN, *op. cit.*, p. 61: Alexander did not understand that "eastern Iran was fighting the national war". Cf. also K. J. BELOCH, «Griechische Geschichte», IV.1 (1925), p. 24; A. V. GUTSCHMID, *Geschichte Irans*, (1888), II. Soviet authors follow this nineteenth century explanation and seriously talk about "the revolt of freedom loving peoples" and "the democratization of the movement" under Spitamenes, and so on. See e.g. the collective *Istoria Turkmenskoi S.S.S.R.* (1957), 77; M. M. DIAKONOV, *Ocherk Istarii Drevn. Irana* (1961), 147, etc. DIODOR., XVII, as his table

he was a satrap of Aria, who at first had surrendered his province to Alexander. Machiavelli notes: in a State governed *per uno principe e per baroni*, the conqueror would have troubles *e con quelli che ti hanno aiutato e con quelli che tu hai oppresso* ⁽¹⁴⁾.

Xerxes in one of his inscriptions speaks of a "restless land" he had to subdue at his accession. He alludes to Bactria, which supported the claim of Ariamenes, its satrap and the brother of Xerxes. On the death of Xerxes in 465, the Bactrians fought for Hystaspis, their satrap, brother and opponent of the new king, Artaxerxes I. Bessus was proclaimed king before the assembled Bactrians ⁽¹⁵⁾. Alexander had to make peace with Bactrian, Sogdian, and Arian barons by leaving them in power. The conqueror who had disdained the hand of Darius's daughter became the son-in-law of a Sogdian sheik ⁽¹⁶⁾. Alexander's marriage to Roxana was not a union between Macedonians and Persians, as Curtius and modern authors wrongly claim, but between a Macedonian lord and the daughter of a baron of Outer Iran. Three years later, at Susa, when Alexander married two royal princesses, he ordered Seleucus to marry a daughter of the Sogdian chieftain Spitamenes, who had led the war against Alexander. Antiochus I, heir of Seleucus, was born of this marriage, and Alexander IV, Alexander's successor, was Roxana's child.

Seleucus conquered western Iran after regaining Babylonia, his satrapy (312): Antigonus had driven him out (315). Despite the renewed struggle with Antigonus in Babylonia, Seleucus, before 306, won the whole far eastern part of Alexander's empire, from the Oxus to the Indus ⁽¹⁷⁾. When he transferred the court to Antioch on the Orontes in 300, he could from this vantage point watch Asia Minor, Syria, and the East. Yet the new capital was far from the eastern frontier.

In 292 Seleucus named his son and heir, Antiochus I, co-regent and vice-roy of the East. The governor-general "over the upper satrapies" was, then, appointed again and again by the Seleucids ⁽¹⁸⁾.

of contents shows, distinguished three phases in Alexander's war in Central Asia. Cf. K. TREVER, «Voprosy Istorii», no. 5 (1947), p. 115.

(14) MACHIAVELLI, *op. cit.*

(15) A. T. OLMSTEAD, *History of the Persian Empire* (1948), 231, 290; DIOD., XVII. 74. Thus Alexander had to let Mazaeus mint silver in his own name, though he had surrendered Babylon and reappointed its satrap. Cf. A. R. BELLINGER, *Essays on the Coinage of Alexander the Great*, «Numism. Studies», II (1963), 60.

(16) CURTIUS, VIII. 4. 23. Cf. e.g. U. V. WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORF, *Aristoteles and Athens*, I (1893), 370: the union with Roxana symbolized reconciliation of the ancestral feud between Europe and Asia.

(17) DIOD., XIX. 92; JUST., XV. 4. 11; APP. SYR., 55. DIOD., XX. 47. 5 writes Antioch was founded where the whole Seleucid Empire might be easily controlled.

(18) The viceroy's title was ὁ ἐν τῶν ἄνω σατραπειῶν. ROBERT, VIII, 72. Cf. BENGTON, II, pp. 78 ff.; SCHMITT, pp. 116 ff. On the governor-general of the East appointed by Antigonus in 315, cf. BENGTON, I, 183. According to Malalas p. 198, Seleucus I had appointed his nephews, Nikanor and Nikodemus, governors of the East (obviously before the coregency of Antiochus I). Cf. ROSTOVITZ, *SEHFW*, p. 476.

The geographical, historical, and economic identity of the Iranian lands was recognized in the administrative organization of the Seleucid empire⁽¹⁹⁾. The king's lieutenant generally lived in Ecbatana (Hamadan)⁽²⁰⁾, at the junction of the roads from Antioch and Mesopotamia to Bactria and the land beyond and, on the other hand, to the Persian gulf.

But the vice-roy could not be more powerful than his master. The long war of Antiochus II with Egypt (260–255), the dynastic "War of Laodice," between the heirs of Antiochus (246–241), the Egyptian intervention (245), the fraternal conflict between Seleucus II and Antiochus Hierax—his viceroy in Asia Minor north of the Taurus (240–236, 230–228)⁽²¹⁾—naturally weakened Seleucid power in the East. The satrap of Bactria, forced to help Antiochus I in his war against Egypt⁽²²⁾, sent twenty elephants into Syria (273).

In later, more dangerous, wars the court of Antioch strained all the resources of the East to save the West. The weakening of the central administration facilitated secession. Diodotus, satrap of Bactria, became independent. "The peoples of the whole Orient" followed his example⁽²³⁾. Since the desert covering almost 2/3 of the territory of the present Empire of Iran made communication difficult with the Farther East except through Bactria, the provinces bordering Afghanistan and Pakistan also became independent, probably under native rulers, or fell under the sway of Indian potentates. Inscriptions of the Indian king Asoka found near Alexandria in Arachosia (Kandahar) prove that he extended his power as far west as the River Helmand, and the border of the Persian desert⁽²⁴⁾.

It is noteworthy that some eighty years after Bessus and Spitamenes, the separatist movement was initiated and led not by native potentates, but by Macedonian generals of the Seleucids and Greek colonists in Outer Iran. "The Hellenes in Bactria" revolted against the court of Antioch. Diodotus was probably a Macedonian. Euthydemus, who wrested the kingship from Diodotus' son, was a Greek colonist, whose ancestors came from Magnesia. The rebels had no animus against the Seleucids. Euthydemus, trying to make his peace with Antiochus III, through the good offices of a man from Magnesia

(19) Cf. G. A. KOSCHELENKO, «VDI», no. 3, 63 (1963). PLIN., *n.h.*, VI.29, refers to *superiora* and *inferiora (regna)* of Parthia. But on this passage cf. E. HERZFELD, «Archaeol. Mitteilungen aus Iran», IV (1934), 6. Cf. PLIN., *n.h.*, VI.29.116.

(20) ROBERT, VIII, 74. PLUT., *Demetr.*, 38; APP., 59: the whole region beyond the Euphrates was ceded to Antiochus I by his father. In 245 Ptolemy III, during his conquest of the Seleucid provinces, entrusted *provincias trans Euphraten* to his general Xantippus: HIERON., in *Dan.*, II.7–9. The frontier between Media and Mesopotamia probably was at the Zagros range: POL., V.44. Cf. SCHMITT, pp. 53 ff.

(21) For chronology cf. «Berytus», VIII (1944), 76 ff.

(22) The Babylonian chronicle ap. SIDNEY SMITH, *Babylonian Historical Texts* (1924), 150.

(23) JUSTIN., XLI.4.5; STR., XI.9.2.

(24) Darius I already talks about "the lands of the east": the provinces beyond the Persian desert. TARN, p. XIX. On the territorial changes in this region cf. SCHMITT, 66.

at Antiochus' headquarters, pretended that he was not a rebel, but had killed the son of a rebel.

The Greek kings in the East later claimed the Seleucid pedigree⁽²⁵⁾. Andragoras, satrap of Parthia, was another Seleucid general who became independent⁽²⁶⁾. Seleucus II and Antiochus Hierax, who tried to seize the empire from one another, failed to punish the defectors.

The native remained quiet. What Justinus says of Parthia applies to all Iran: after Alexander's death, the population of Parthia and the other peoples of Upper Asia followed Eumenes during the civil war between the Macedonians. When he was defeated, Antigonus ruled, then Seleucus Nicator, then Antiochus and his successors⁽²⁷⁾. The Arsacids, Scythian invaders from the North, led a foreign tribe (Parni) under Antiochus II into Bactria, and captured Parthia during the war between Seleucus II and Antiochus Hierax. We may quote Machiavelli once more:

Dario morto, rimesso ad Alessandro quello stato sicuro per le ragioni di sopra discorse... nè in quello regno nacquono altri tumulti che quelli che loro proprii suscitavano⁽²⁸⁾.

Whatever the motives—unknown to us—of Diodotus, Andragoras and his companions, the Greeks of Outer Iran—in the middle of the third century—thought they could do without future help from Antioch's court, and believed they had been exploited and neglected by the central government. This reasoning proved just. The kings of Bactria, whose riches amazed the Greeks, defended the territory for two centuries, subdued part of India. But the Seleucids could offer no aid when nomads from the north attacked (c. 135).

The independence of Bactria changed it, in modern usage, from a "colonial" land to an "Asiatic" state. The flowering of Hellenism would have been impossible if Egypt, Syria, Mesopotamia etc. had remained colonial possessions of the Macedonian crown. The defection of Bactria pushed self-identification by Alexander's former subjects a step further. The self-assertion of Bactria demanded the union of Greek settlers and local barons. The Greeks surely did not disrupt traditional relations between native tribes and their chiefs, and they must have established mutually profitable relations with the population of numerous villages. Of course, at first the colonists must have

(25) STRABO, XI. 516; POL., XI. 34. On the false pedigree cf. TARN, pp. 201 and 446.

(26) Cf. J. WOLSKI, in «Serta», G. KAZAROV, «Ephemerid. of the Bulgarian Inst. of Archaeology», XIV (1950), pp. 111 ff. But numismatic evidence points to an earlier date (c. 300) for Andragoras, who issued coins in his own name. D. SCHLUMBERGER, «L'argent Grec dans l'Empire Achéménide», (1953), p. 30.

(27) JUST., XLI. 4. There is no evidence for the idea that the Bactrian revolt and defection of Parthia were promoted by Iranian nationalism. J. WOLSKI has suggested this: «Klio», XXXVIII (1960), pp. 110 ff.

(28) MACHIAVELLI, *op. cit.*

encroached on the arable and grazing land of the natives. But the Greeks extended irrigation. After the first shock of land confiscation, the barons, who, as we have seen, remained in power, must have discovered the amenities of Greek city life and the advantages of collaboration with the Greek force.

We may surmise that Roxane and Apame were only the first living links between the Iranian aristocracy of Bactria and the colonists. The most essential reason for the collaboration between the old and the new landlords was, however, the necessity to hang together or to be hanged separately. The nomadic invasion from the North of teeming masses of hungry pastoral peoples beyond the Amu Daria would have destroyed Greek cities and dispossessed the sheiks and their tribes.

The Seleucids naturally tried to regain lost provinces. Seleucus II, in 231, allied with Diodotus II of Bactria—who was alarmed when the Arsacids established themselves on the main road from Bactria to the West—successfully campaigned against the Arsacids. Seleucus had coins decorated with emblems of Parthian weapons, but was forced to return home: his aunt Stratonice organized a rebellion in Antioch; a new war with Antiochus Hierax broke out⁽²⁹⁾.

Less than ten years later, Molon and Alexandros—two brothers who jointly exercised the general-governorship of the upper regions in the Seleucid Empire—followed the example of Diodotus of Bactria (222), on the accession of Alexander III. Molon and Alexandros commanded troops in Media and Persia respectively. Molon proclaimed himself king.

This again was a military insurrection of Macedonian troops. It is significant that the advisers of Antiochus III believed, and experience later, in the beginning of 220, proved them right, that the personal appearance of the king would be enough to restore the army's obedience.

While Molon reigned for a limited time in the East, Antiochus III could, paradoxically, wage war in Syria (221), with his loyal troops, against Ptolemy IV. Molon himself obtained neutrality from the governors of neighboring satrapies; after his defeat and death, Antiochus III found he need not go to Persia. The Greek Molon and his Macedonian troops were supported not by the Persians, but by Seleucia, the Macedonian colony on the Tigris⁽³⁰⁾.

(29) On the beginnings of the Arsacids cf. « Berytus », VIII (1944), pp. 73 ff. My learned friend J. Wolski has again and again denied Arrian's version. J. WOLSKI maintains the Arsacids had begun their revolt in Bactria under Antiochus; cf. « Berytus », XII (1956), pp. 35 ff.; « Historia », VIII (1959), pp. 222 ff.; XI (1962), pp. 138 ff. We might follow the common source of Justin-Strabo and say the Arsacids originated during the war between Seleucus II and Antiochus Hierax: 239–232. But the Arsacids dated their regnal years from 247. The beginning of a dynasty can be antedated. The Sasanians did this. While the importance of the humble start is exaggerated, the start must be there. Hence the Arsacid official reckoning confirms Arrian's chronology. It is not a late invention. (J. WOLSKI assumes this). STRABO, XI. 515, cites Arrian's chronology as a variant of the tradition (some say that Arsaces was a Bactrian); APPIAN, *Syr.*, 65, uses Arrian's chronology.

(30) STR., XI. 8.8; JUST., XLI. 4; NEWELL, 202.

In 212 Antiochus III began reconquest of the Upper Satrapies ⁽³¹⁾. Xerxes of Armenia recognized the Seleucid suzerainty. When Xerxes died, Antiochus annexed the country and divided it between two native governors ⁽³²⁾. In 209, following the great road from Ecbatama, through the Caspian gates, Antiochus III reached Hecatompylae. The Parthian king fled, but then acknowledged the supremacy of the Seleucid monarch. The successful war with Euthydemus of Bactria lasted two years. It ended with a pact, whose terms are unknown. Antiochus III conceded the royal title and, probably, independence to Euthydemus. But the authorization itself established the preeminence of Antiochus III. This was shown by the delivery of Bactrian war elephants to the conqueror.

Antiochus III then crossed Hindu-Kush, received elephants and tribute from an Indian prince, and returned to Mesopotamia through the southern provinces of Iran and the Persian gulf (205-4). As Polybius writes ⁽³³⁾, Antiochus III made governors of upper satrapies, dynasts, and cities subject again to the Seleucid court. He punished Molon and Achaeos in Asia Minor as rebels, but arranged terms with those vanquished in Outer Iran. He ignored the ministers advising him to depose Xerxes of Armenia. Thus he created an outer pacified sphere of independent but friendly principalities. Before him the Achaemenids and later the Caesars created and tolerated semi-independent buffer states beyond the imperial frontier ⁽³⁴⁾.

Events in the West again upset the balance in the East. The defeat of Antiochus III in the Roman war (189) ended Seleucid control of Outer Iran. Yet Antiochus IV, son of Antiochus III, became "stronger than any other king" of that time ⁽³⁵⁾, and tried to regain the Farther East in 165. Antiochus IV—like his father in 212—reestablished suzerainty over Armenia ⁽³⁶⁾, went down to Mesopotamia, Persia and, perhaps, the Persian gulf, to reestablish

(31) On Molon cf. SCHMITT, 116 ff.; E. WILL, «REG», LXXV (1962), 72 ff., who (p. 104) rightly emphasizes the revolt was not caused by nationalism.

(32) M. HOLLEAUX, «CAH», VIII (1930), pp. 140 ff.; SCHMITT, pp. 62 ff., 85 ff.

(33) Artaxias became independent after the defeat of Antiochus III in the Roman war (189). On the coinage of Armenia cf. H. SEYRIG, «Rev. Numism.» (1955), 111 ff. and 126 n. 46. Armenia was part of the Seleucid Empire (STR., XI. 531; APP., Syr., 55). Therefore, Arsames, who supported Antiochus Hierax against Seleucus (POLYAEN., IV. 17), paid tribute, to the Seleucid overlord (POL., VIII. 23).

(34) POL., XI. 34. Concerning the frontier between Parthia and Media, cf. SCHMITT, 51; the frontier between the territory of Antiochus and Bactria was probably established on the river Arius (Tejen).

(35) POL., VIII. 25; E. R. BEVAN, «The House of Seleucus», II (1902), p. 15; BENTSON, II, p. 61.

(36) DIOD., XXXI. 17 a. Tarn believes (*op. cit.*, p. 213) Eucratides of Bactria was the general of Antiochus: the one who took Eastern Iran from Antiochus in 166. That hypothesis is not supported by evidence. Cf. e.g.: S. P. TOLSTOV, *Drevni Choresm* (1948), p. 239; N. K. NARAIN, *The Indo-Greeks* (1957), pp. 54 ff. Euthydemus may have been satrap of Sogdiana: V. M. MASSON, «VDI», no. 2 (1955), p. 42. As for the thanksgiving feast of Antiochus at Babylon in 166, we must not forget that the relevant inscription is incomplete.

the royal presence in these countries ⁽³⁷⁾. Antiochus IV then marched on the main road to Ecbatana, the military centre in the north, probably to challenge the Arsacids of Parthia, who had captured the northern part of Media. He died at Gabai (Isfahan) ⁽³⁸⁾.

Afterward the struggle between two branches of the Seleucid house (Demetrius I, brother of Antiochus, and Antiochus V, the son of Antiochus) enabled Timarchus, satrap of Media and vice-roy of the East, to seize the crown ⁽³⁹⁾. He was recognized by the Roman Senate. Artaxias of Armenia was allied with him. Demetrius I subdued him.

The continuous power struggle in the West allowed Mithridates I of Parthia to conquer Media, then Mesopotamia (141). The Parthian extended his sway "from the mountains of Caucasus to the river Euphrates" ⁽⁴⁰⁾. The Seleucids twice tried to regain these provinces. But the disintegration of the central government made them dependent on the cities, in Syria as well as in Mesopotamia and Iran ⁽⁴¹⁾.

The campaigns of Demetrius II (140) and Antiochus VII (130-29) confirm Machiavelli's maxim. "The Macedonians and Greeks" begged Demetrius II to liberate them. For they were used to the Macedonian lordship but indignant at the arrogance of the new masters. Demetrius II was helped by "the peoples of the Orient", contingents from Persia, Elymais, Bactria. He defeated the Parthians "in a thousand battles", yet by some trick fell into the hands of the Parthians; they paraded through the cities which had defected from Mithridates and made their attachment to him ridiculous ⁽⁴²⁾.

Ten years later Antiochus VII was helped by the defection of Oriental kings who reviled Parthian arrogance, and by the Greek cities. Seleucus on the Tigris put to death the Parthian satrap. The Parthian Empire disintegrated.

Cf. «OGIS», 253 = E. GABBA, *Iscrizione... per lo Studio della Bibbia* (1958), 7; J. and L. ROBERT no. 321 (1962).

(37) DIOD., XXXI.17 a; APP., *Syr.*, 45; PLIN., *n. h.*, VI.147. It is most doubtful that Antiochus IV was *Antiochus quintus regum* who restored Charax (PLIN., *n. h.*, VI.138). Antiochus II would be the "fifth" Macedonian King in Persia. On the history of Charax, cf. G. LE RIDDER, «Syria», XXXVI (1959), pp. 229 ff.

(38) POL., XXXI.II.3; PORPH., 260 fr. 56 Jacoby: Antiochus died at Tabai. Modern scholars change the name to Gabai (now Isfahan). Cf. STRABO, XVI.728. Cf. ED. MEYER, *Ursprung und Anfaenge des Christentums*, II n. 5 (1921), 220; H. BENGTSON, *Griechische Geschichte* (2nd. ed. 1961), 424; M. HOLLEAUX, *Études*, III (1942), 272. Gabai or Tabai was on the road from Persepolis to Ecbatana (CURT., V.13.2), and Antiochus died on his way to the same military centre (II Macc. 9.3). On the Parthian conquest of northern Media, cf. JUST., XLI.5.9.

(39) Timarchus minted at Ecbatana: A. R. BELLINGER, *Americ. Numism. Soc. Museum Notes*, I (1945), pp. 37 ff. On coins of Demetrius I minted at Ecbatana, cf. G. K. JENKINS, *Numism. Chronicle*, VI, Series XI (1951), pp. 1 ff.

(40) JUST., XLI.6.8.

(41) For Syria cf. H. SEYRIG, *Notes on Syrian Coins*, «NNM», 119 (1950), pp. 17 ff.

(42) JOS. A., XIII.185; JUST., XXXVI.1, 3-5. Cf. JUST., XXVII.1.1: cities for Ptolemy II, against Laodice.

Antiochus VII regained Mesopotamia and Persia. He demanded the evacuation of all territories outside Parthia proper and the payment of tribute. He fell in battle with the Parthians⁽⁴³⁾. It was easy to conquer, hard to maintain the results of victory.

We recounted these somewhat tedious political events so that we might prove that Iran remained loyal or, at least, obedient to the Seleucids, from the time of Seleucus I until the Parthian conquest⁽⁴⁴⁾. The house of Seleucus was threatened by insubordination of its own generals in Iran, not by native revolts. From c. 215 on, however, the Ptolemies faced chronic rebellion by Egyptians. Native pharaohs opposed the Macedonian pharaoh; sometimes all Upper Egypt escaped the rule of the Alexandrian court. We must assume the viewpoint of a man in Susa or Ecbatana, if we are to understand this difference between Egypt and Iran.

The Macedonian conquest deprived Iran of the royal presence. The court no longer spent the summer months in Ecbatana, and winter in Susa⁽⁴⁵⁾. The Achaemenids no longer had Ten Thousand "Immortals". The Macedonians dispossessed the upper crust of Iranian society. The satraps, high officials, generals were now mostly Greeks. The big landholdings of many Persian grandees—the land held by the satrap Arsham in Egypt c. 400, for example—went to the Macedonian favorites of the new masters⁽⁴⁶⁾.

But these changes disturbed only some individuals. The Seleucids did not disqualify or degrade the natives as such. Antiochus I was a son of a Bactrian lady, and his descendants intermarried again and again with the Iranian potentates. Antiochus Hierax married a daughter of the Bithynian king, his two sisters the kings of Cappadocia and of Pont; his nieces, two daughters of Seleucus II, married a certain Mithridates, and Xerxes of Armenia. Antiochus III, nephew of Antiochus Hierax, married a cousin, daughter of Mithridates II of Pontus. A daughter of Antiochus III married Demetrius I of Bactria, another became the wife of Ariarthes of Cappadocia, and so on. Hellenized Iranians became Seleucid generals and governors⁽⁴⁷⁾.

(43) JOS. A., XIII.251; JUST., XXXVIII.10; DIOD., XXXIV, 17-19; APP., *Syr.*

(44) This general statement does not preclude temporary, local clashes. A governor of Mesene (*Numenium ab Antiocho rege Mesenae praepositum*), we are told, won two battles on the same day against "the Persians": on sea, in a cavalry attack (PLIN., *n. h.*, VI.152). Oborzos, who may be the Persepolis dynast, had 3000 ἀνδρες τῶν ἐν τῇ Περσίδι κατοικούν murdered: he considered them dangerous. He had military authority over the settlers, could summon them to arms, and therefore could fulfill his plan. The story (POLYAEN., VII.40) reveals this. POLYAEN. (VII.39) writes about a revolt of a Persian regiment and suppression of the revolt by Macedonian and Thracian regiments. This probably occurred during the power struggle between Seleucus I and Antigonos.

(45) The palace at Ecbatana was used as the headquarters of Media's satrap; STRABO, XI.524. There was a royal ἀλλή at Susa: «SEG», VII.4.

(46) On Arsham cf. G. R. DRIVER, *Aramaic Documents* (1957). Cf. e.g. XEN., *Anab.*, I.4.9; G. CARDACIA, *Les Archives des Murasou* (1951), p. 7. On the confiscation of land cf. PLUT., *Eumen.*, 8.

(47) Cf. M. LAUNEY, *Recherches sur les Armées Hellénistiques* (1949), pp. 546 ff.

In Jerusalem, the Seleucids spoke of the "Deity". In Babylonia the rare priests who still could write cuneiforms revived royal titles two millenniums old to describe the might of Antiochus I "the Macedonian", "the care-taker" of Babylon's cathedrals⁽⁴⁸⁾. Antiochus, who founded the temple of the Babylonian god Nebo (268), was probably represented in Persia as a devotee of Ahura-Mazda⁽⁴⁹⁾. If someone wished to worship Sarapis, the god of Alexandria, he was welcomed too⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Greek was the language of the court and administration. Aramaic, imperial language of the Achaemenids, was still used for written communication throughout Iran: from Susa to the Caspian sea, from Armenia and Georgia to Kandahar⁽⁵¹⁾.

By necessity or choice the Achaemenids tolerated the religions, idiosyncrasies of those conquered. But the Achaemenids were fiercely Persian. The Seleucids were "Macedonians"⁽⁵²⁾, and the Greeks might call their realm "Macedonian", but since they had no political connection with the old country, their rule was supernational. It was an agglutinated empire, held together by the king, his court, his army and the financial bureaucracy—something like the Hapsburg monarchy without Roman Catholicism. It is hard to imagine a Seleucid speaking in the vein of Darius: "Ahuramazda... made Darius king... I am Darius... a Persian, an Aryan". Under the Seleucids, a Carian could be a vezir and Aetolian commander of the royal army. There was nothing like the seven princely houses of the Persian, whose heads were peers of the Shah.

The court in remote Antioch did not, and could not, try to make those subdued change their way of life, even had some reformer wanted this. A multinational empire which extended from the Phoenician coast to the Indian Ocean could not be transformed: a royal order published in Phrygia on May 6, 193 reached Persia fifty days later⁽⁵³⁾. As Edmund Burke warned the British Parliament concerning the American revolution, distance must weaken authority: "This is the immutable condition, the eternal law of extensive and detached empire". Not infected by the Christian zeal which later became the liberal itch, the Seleucids did not try to convert anybody—either to the true religion or good plumbing. They left people as dirty and blissful as they had been before the Macedonian conquest. "A wise and salutary neglect", to quote Burke again, maintained peace within the Seleucid Empire.

Moreover the economy changed slowly. In the Orient the Greeks prom-

(48) J. PRITCHARD, *Ancient Near Eastern Texts* (1950), 317. Cf. J. OELSNER, «Zeitschr. fuer Assyriologie», LVI (1964), pp. 262-74.

(49) On monuments of fire worship in Seleucid Iran, cf. A. GODARD, *L'Art de l'Iran* (1962), p. 172; GHIRSHMAN, 33.

(50) ROBERT, XI-XII (1960), p. 8.

(51) Cf. W. B. HENNING, *Mitteliranisch*, «Handbuch der Orientalistik», ed. B. Spuler I.4.1 (1958), pp. 22-37. E. BENVENISTE, «J. Asiat.», 1964, 141.

(52) CH. EDSON, «Jr. Cl. Phil.», LIII (1958), pp. 153-170.

(53) ROBERT, VII, p. 7. Cf. A. AYMARD, «REA», LI (1949), p. 340.

oted a money economy. But in the eastern part of the Seleucid Empire, coins became part of everyday life only centuries later. The tetradrachmas of the rich predominate in the finds of the third century in Turkestan; drachmas became common under the Parthians, but bronze handled in the bazaars by poor men circulated freely only in the I-III centuries A.D. ⁽⁵⁴⁾. From c. 100 B.C. barbarian potentates beyond the Oxus, and the local rulers, had to have their own coins: this was an inheritance of the Greek age.

The long, narrow Nile valley, much easier to control, was the object of Ptolemaic experiments. To increase their means of action quickly and enrich their treasury, the Ptolemies, like Mohammed Aly two millenia later, decided to reform the structure of the traditional society in Egypt ⁽⁵⁵⁾. Yet, as Plato knew, every change invites revolution. Polybius tells us that in the war against Antiochus III, Ptolemy III formed a native phalanx. The Egyptians took credit for the victory at Raphia (217), no longer obeyed orders, and sought their own leaders: they could defend themselves ⁽⁵⁶⁾.

The Seleucid phalanx was recruited from Macedonians in the Seleucid Empire. When Antiochus III formed a second phalanx of ten thousand men in 217, he did not organize it as a native corps, as Ptolemy IV did, but enlisted men "selected from the whole realm". The natives served as light infantry and horse, as archers, etc. The cavalry was the main force of the Iranian rulers, the Achaemenids, Arsacids, the Sassanids, the Greek dynasties of Bactria: Euthydemus brought 10,000 horsemen against Antiochus III. The Seleucids appreciated Median horses, and had Transoxanian cavalrymen in the army. But no Persian or Median cavalry regiments are mentioned in our sources, and the Seleucids did not have a *magister equitum* as the Arsacids and the Sassanids later did. This neglect of splendid Iranian horsemen was probably deliberate.

Iranian riders were recruited by barons and sheiks among their clients and tribesmen and commanded by the local potentates. Chiefs and their retainers appeared cuirassed, the rest as light horse ⁽⁵⁷⁾. The Seleucids refused

(54) On monetary circulation in Turkestan cf. V. M. MASSON, « VDI », no. 2 (1955), p. 42. For the introduction of monetary economy in the Near East, cf. M. ROSTOVITZEFF, *SEHHW*, I, p. 76. For monetary circulation in the Persian Empire, cf. D. SCHLUMBERGER, *L'argent Grec dans l'Empire Achéménide* (1953), pp. 28 ff. On the imitations of the coins of Eucratides by barbarian potentates in Choresmia, cf. B. I. VAINBERG, « VDI », no. 1 (1960), p. 125.

(55) I traced a parallel between the *étatisme* of Ptolemy II and the politics of MOHAMMED-ALY in the « Renaissance »: II/III (New York: 1945), pp. 381 ff. I plan to resume this subject.

(56) POL., V. 107. 1: ὡς ἔκαστοι βοηθοὶ ὄντες αἰρούσιν. On the Seleucid army cf. *IS*, ch. III. BENGTON (II, 68) rightly objected when I wrote (p. 74) that Orientals composed the supplementary phalanx of Antiochus III (POL., V. 79. 4).

(57) Eucratides: POL., X. 49. 1. On the Iranian *magister equitum* cf. M. L. CHAUMONT, « Journ. Asiat. », CCXLIX (1961), p. 297; CCL (1962), p. 11; M. SZNYCER, « Semitica », XIII (1963), p. 32. The Seleucids may have transferred some Transoxanian tribes to steppes south of the Oxus. Antiochus III had the Dahae in the battle of Magnesia (190). On such transfers

to entrust their military power to the caprice and interest of the Iranian landlords. The Seleucids demanded only passive obedience from the conquered peoples. Life in Persia or Media under Seleucid rule remained essentially the same as under the Achaemenids. The Persian aristocracy, as before, dominated the countryside, and the tenant, who even today does not share in a quarter of the harvest⁽⁵⁸⁾, hardly cared whether his absentee landlord bore a Persian or a Macedonian name.

But Iranians and Greeks, sharecroppers and barons, tribal sheiks and town traders expected the royal government to protect them from nomads of the North. The Persians themselves came from the region beyond the Oxus and established their tents at Susa c. 700⁽⁵⁹⁾. After four centuries of sedentary life, they dreaded the new waves of hungry migrants from the immense ocean of sand which extends east of the Caspian sea. From Zoroaster to medieval epics, the opposition between the sedentary population and the rovers of the desert, between Iran and Turan, is a recurring theme in Persian tradition.

Soviet excavations have shown that agricultural life began quite early in the well watered mountain valleys in the Transoxania⁽⁶⁰⁾. Tillers of the soil followed the courses of the Oxus and Iaxartus, and in classical antiquity the irrigated land on the lower Oxus and Iaxartus amounted to ca. 45,000 sq. km.: three times the area now cultivated⁽⁶¹⁾. But these oases were surrounded by some 600,000 sq. km. of desert steppe unfit for agriculture, and could sustain only pastoral nomads: they move from a deep well and a primitive cistern to another precarious source of water; the farmer is bound to the permanent, abundant water supply. In rich and fertile Bactria, the Ancients clearly distinguished between grain soil, pasture, and desert⁽⁶²⁾.

cf. L. DILLEMANN, *Haute Mésopotamie Orientale* (1962), p. 95. On Median horses cf. M. ROSTOVITZEFF, «AJA», XLVI (1942), p. 297. On the cuirassiers cf. M. ROSTOVITZEFF, «Yale Class. Stud.», V (1935), p. 163. Cf. the new archaeological evidence in TOLSTOV, p. 148 and f. 82; he refers to ARR., IV.4.4. On the feudal character of the Iranian host, cf. G. WIDENGREN, «Orientalia Suecana», V (1956), pp. 95 ff.

(58) Cf. A. K. S. LAMBTON, *Landlord and Peasant in Persia* (1953), p. 310.

(59) R. GHIRSHMAN, *Un Village Perso-Achémenide*, «Mémoires de la Mission Archéologique en Iran», XXXVI (1954), p. 72.

(60) Radio-carbon dating shows agriculture existed in the valley of Kar-Darya (Ferghana) as early as 1100: J. A. ZADNEPROVSKI, *Drevnezemledelcheskaja Kultura Fergany*, «MIA», 118 (1963), p. 70. S. I. RUDENKO (ed.), *Novye Metody archeol. issledovanija* (1963), 26 ff.: c. 2750 is given as the earliest radio-carbon date for agriculture in the Turkestan and the Soviet Union generally. (The radio-carbon date 6590 ± 110 before our time—1750 B.C.—is aberrant).

It is remarkable that iron tools do not appear in Iran and Turkestan before the VII–VI centuries. Cf. ZADNEPROVSKI, *op. cit.*, p. 165 (Ferghana); TOLSTOV (below n. 54), p. 89 (Choresmia); GHIRSHMAN (see the preceding note), p. 74 (Susa). This confirms the observations of HEROD., I.215 and STRABO, XI.513.

(61) TOLSTOV, p. 16.

(62) CURT., VII.4.26.

Many tribes on the borders of irrigated land were seminomadic, and combined pastoral economy with poorly developed cultivation of the soil. Yet these tribes did not become sedentary. They continued to live in tents and preserved the tradition of mobility⁽⁶³⁾. Grazing lands were free, the nomad independent of landlords and tax collectors. As Aristotle observed, the shepherd gets his subsistence, without trouble, from tame animals⁽⁶⁴⁾. Cattle and sheep, the nomad's capital, reproduce themselves. By selling part of the yearly increase of flocks, produce of the pastoral economy (skins etc.), the nomad could barter and trade with the settled population and so obtain the products he lacked: salt, metals, etc.⁽⁶⁵⁾. A tribe could roam a thousand kilometers in one year⁽⁶⁶⁾. This mobility made life less drab, fostered independence and self-reliance. The Turkomans, inhabiting the steppe east of the Southern Caspian, were feared as rovers of the desert. The chief occupation was husbandry: roving was a privilege of the tribe's wealthy members⁽⁶⁷⁾.

The nomads, above all semi-nomads, became dangerous when a calamity—disease, an enemy raid, a water channel that had changed its course—suddenly reduced their animal stock: both nomads and semi-nomads usually lived in more or less peaceful symbiosis with their sedentary neighbours. Disaster meant the irretrievable loss of capital. Tilled land stricken by a flood may be productive again the following year. The pastoral population which has lost a great part of its flocks can pursue a pastoral life no longer. Nor can the pastoral population become sedentary without new capital; it can be obtained only through the *razzia*.

Forced to leave "Scythia" by discord at home, the Parni, led by the Arsacids, invaded the Seleucid province of Parthia. But the Parni, who pastured their flocks in the mountains in summer and in the plains in winter, were always at war with those whose territory they captured. About a century later some events, perhaps the change in the course of the Jana-Darya in the Syr-Darya delta, compelled the tribes, who had lived a settled life for over three centuries, move again, to invade Bactria⁽⁶⁸⁾.

(63) T. A. ZHDANKO, *Trudy*, pp. 170 ff. Cf. X. DE PLANHOL, *De la Plaine Pamphylenne aux Lacs Pisidiens* (1958).

(64) ARIST., *Pol.*, 1256 a.

(65) F. BARTH, *The Nomads of South Persia* (Oslo: «Universitetes Etnografiske Museum», 1961) Bulletin no. 8, p. 17: the average net family income of the Basseri tribe near Shiraz—from selling pastoral products, after the tribe has satisfied its own food needs—is ca. \$ 500 per annum; much higher than a farmer's net income.

(66) V. I. PRINCE MASALSKI, *Turkestan'ski Krai* (1913), 489.

(67) V. V. BARTOLD, *Iz Kulturnoi Zhizni Turkestana* (1928), p. 120. K. A. AKISHEV, G. A. KUSCHAEV, *Drevneia Kultura Sakov i Usunei* (1963), p. 257: among the horse riding Saka, pastoral nomads in the Transoxania, the size of mound graves (*kurgans*) varied with the status of the dead (warrior: noble: ruler) in the approximate ratio 1:5:12.

(68) On the settlement of the Jana-Darya territory, cf. S. P. TOLSTOV, pp. 136 ff. and in *Trudy*, pp. 147 ff. He identified this settled population with the Apasiacae (POL., X.48). He believes the migration of the Sacae southward was determined "by a deep political crisis of the (Bactrian) state ruled by the Graeco-Macedonian conquerors, and the tendency of

The Seleucids, the Achaemenids before them, kept watch on the northern frontier ⁽⁶⁹⁾. Walled military settlements built in echelon manner on rivers flowing east or west formed barriers in depth. The elephants belonging to the satrap of Bactria would be useless against cavalry raids of the nomads, decisive against the horde attacking one of these Seleucid fortresses. Media ⁽⁷⁰⁾, considered "the most valuable" of all Asia's governments, was full of Greek cities, established "for protection against the invading barbarians".

During the wars of Alexander's successors, the troops on the frontier went to Asia Minor: they fought with Eumenes against Antigonus. The nomads then overran such exposed cities as Alexandria Eschate on the Jaxartus, Alexandria Margiana (Merv), and Artacaena (on the Tejend). At the same time, for the same reason, most of the Macedonian troops marched out of India and left it to the ambition of Sandracottas ⁽⁷¹⁾. Seleucus I abandoned India to the new Maurya ruler; he, and his son Antiochus, coregent and viceroy, reestablished the northern frontier.

In the second decennium of the third century, Antiochus walled off the whole oasis of Merv ad Artacaene. The area of Alexandria Margiana (Merv) —ca. 2500 sq. km.—was encircled by a wall of beaten earth and bricks over 20 m. high and 5 m. thick extending some 250 km. Some 30 km. of this wall are still visible. Built on the border of the fertile land, this line of towered fortification protected the oasis not only against the Nomads, but also against a more dangerous foe: the moving high sands of the surrounding desert. Other walls inside protected the territory of Alexandria Margiana and the city itself. A dam made the waters of the Murgab serve for land irrigation ⁽⁷²⁾.

Demodocus, general of Antiochus, explored the Caspian sea. When Demodocus reached the eastern end of the frontier, he crossed the Iaxartes, traditional boundary of the settled region, and on the other river established the altars of Apollo of Didyma, patron saint of the Seleucids. The god of the dynasty marked the Seleucid boundary and watched over the frontier.

the masses of the population under them to receive aid in their struggle against them from the northern tribes" (p. 165). That is an anachronistic fantasy and is not even Marxism. It is generally assumed the Sacae were driven out by the invasion of the Yueji. Cf. W. M. McGOVERN, *The Early Empires of Central Asia* (1939), p. 127. The destruction of the vital elements of the irrigation mechanism would suffice to drive out the Sacae at the Jana-Darya. The destruction of the dam on the Murgab by the Bukharians in 1784 made the Merv oasis a desert: A. WOEIKOF, *Le Turkestan Russe* (1914), p. 178.

(69) Ancient sources emphasize Nomadic danger for Iran: STRABO, 507-8 (brigands and warriors); 509 (nomads and brigands); 511 (the nomads who took Bactriana from the Greeks).

(70) POL., X. 27.

(71) DIOD., XIX. 14, 56.

(72) PLIN., *n. h.*, VI. 47-9; VI. 93; STRABO, XI. 516. On the Jaxartes as a boundary cf. STRABO, XI. 517. On Seleucid Margiana cf. S. A. VIAZIGIN, *Trudy of the South Turkmenian Archaeol. Exped.*, I (1949), p. 260 ff.; M. E. MASSON, «VDI», no. 4 (1951), pp. 89 ff.; PUGACHENKOVA, «VDI», no. 2 (1952), pp. 26, 216. These publications have no map showing the trace of Antiochus's wall.

When Diodotus of Bactria defected from the Seleucids, he and his successors continued, in their own interest, to ward off the barbarians of the deserts and thus protect Iran. Euthydemus of Bactria, urging the victorious Antiochus III to make peace, mentioned the nomad hordes threatening both of them. If these hordes were admitted, the country would no doubt become barbarized. Antiochus understood the implied threat and made terms with the Bactrian.

The only important group of nomads infiltrating the Seleucid realm were the Parni, led by the Arsacids. But the Parni too remained isolated in Hyrcania and Parthia for almost a century, between the Caspian and the great arid desert separating them from Persia. The nomads of this great Iranian desert were kept in check. They raided Parthia and Hyrcanis, and like all nomads, as Strabo writes, now attacked their neighbours, now made peace with them ⁽⁷³⁾.

The Parthian conquest of Iran did not change the situation. The first Arsaces, like so many founders of dynasties, lived by robbery and rapine. His descendants, on their Greek coins, called themselves Philhellenes, Just, Beneficent. Phraates II and Artabanus II died in the battles against new waves of nomads. The Arsacids became defendes of the sedentary population ⁽⁷⁴⁾.

After some conflicts with Greek cities in Iran and Mesopotamia, the Arsacids learned to behave. The letter Artabanus wrote to Susa in 21 A.D. about a contested election ⁽⁷⁵⁾ might have been penned by an Antiochus. German (and now Soviet) authors who unduly emphasize the failure of Antiochus VII to reconquer the East ⁽⁷⁶⁾ are misled by nineteenth century nationalism. These authors believe civilization follows the flag. Voltaire reigned while the Bourbons suffered defeats. Greek civilization in the East was protected not by the Macedonian sarissa, but by the Gorgona of Athena herself.

Alexander was the "armed philosopher", who invaded Persia "with greater assistance from Aristotle than from Philip". He civilized wild peoples, and "by his deeds and by the lessons he taught, he was a great philosopher". Persian children in Persia, Susiana, Gedrosia now sang the verses of Euripides and Sophocles. Following Strabo and Plutarch ⁽⁷⁷⁾, modern historians rave about the spread of Greek universalism. But the scene appears less rosy from the vantage point of Susa or Ecbatana.

(73) POL., XI.34; STRABO, XI.511.

(74) Cf. e.g. the report on the Parthian fortress at Chasarap in Choresmia: S. P. TOLSTOV, *Materialy Choresmkoj Ekspedicii*, VI (1963), p. 194.

(75) C. B. WELLES, *Royal Correspondence* (1934), 75.

(76) Cf. e.g. Ed. MEYER, *Ursprung und Geschichte des Christentums*, II (1921), p. 272. A. G. BOKSHCHANIN, *Parfiya i Rim* (1960), p. 248: the defeat of Antiochus VII was "the decisive turning point in the whole history of the slave-holding Mediterranean world", and "the smashing blow for the whole system of Greek domination in Anterior Asia".

(77) STR., XV.715; PLUT., *de fort. Alex.*, 3 (328).

The universalism of the new masters was no innovation in the Achaemenid empire. The Persians, Herodotus notes, were always willing to borrow elements of civilization from their neighbours ⁽⁷⁸⁾. In Persian Babylonia we see men of all nationalities living peacefully together—from Egyptians, Jews and Moabites to Afghans and Indians—under the rule of the Achaemenids. A contract of marriage between a Persian and an Egyptian woman is written in cuneiform script. Arameans, Babylonians, Egyptians are witnesses. Personal names indicate this. (The scribes do not mention the nationality of their employers). In the archives of the business house of Murashu in the second half of the fifth century, twenty three *ustabars*, high officers of the court—one of them standing behind the crown prince Xerxes on the Persepolis relief of Darius—happen to be mentioned. Ten of them bear Iranian, thirteen Babylonian names ⁽⁷⁹⁾.

But the Persian masters had force without a unique civilization. The language of the administration was Aramaic, the court physicians Egyptian and Greek, the craftsmen of the court of all nationalities except Persian. After two centuries of Empire the Persian still learned horse riding, archery, abhorrence of the Lie ⁽⁸⁰⁾.

Hellenism was irresistible for it joined power with civilization, two mutually necessary complements, whose separation, as our age has shown, brings crisis. In the balance of history, the Macedonian spear added weight to Plato and Aristotle. Hellenic civilization was secular; thus it essentially differed from those of the Orient. Hellenic civilization was neither monopolized by priests nor the prerogative of scribes.

Hellenization demanded no conversion, transformation, only the ability to speak the Greek language and the desire to think in it. Therefore Hellenization could, and did, remain superficial. Both the Greek and native worlds moved within their own orbits; these met only at the point named "the government". While the Greeks did not have to know the native languages, most of the natives did not have to know Greek. But Greek domination formed a new middle class of natives, who had learned Greek for government service. Since neither race nor religion separated the Hellenized natives from the Greeks, the new *intelligenza* recruited among the native soon broke away from the masses and became thoroughly Greek not only in language, but also in spirit.

Hellenization brought about cultural change only when promoted by native rulers who had cast off Macedonian dominion. The native princes needed Greeks, Greek cities in their realms, Greek civilization: these kept the ship of State afloat, enabling it to play a role in international politics; Hellenization was the price of independence.

(78) HEROD., I. 135; G. CARDASCIA, *Les Archives des Murashu* (1957).

(79) G. CARDASCIA, *Société Jean Bodin*, Recueil IX (1958), pp. 115 ff.

(80) "Lie": violation of the promise of obedience given a superior. Darius I thought men who resisted his seizure of power were inspired by a "Lie". A violation of the vassal's obligations was also a "Lie". G. WIDENGREN, in *«Orientalia Suecana»*, V (1956), p. 82.

From Mithridates I, the empire-builder, the Parthian kings, on their coins, proclaimed in Greek they were "Philhellenes". In Jerusalem, the Maccabee Aristobulus called himself "Philhellene" only sixty years after the Maccabean insurrection. Hellenization meant Greek schools, the study of Homer, Euripides. Armenia was completely independent when some one engraved verses of Euripides on a rock near Erivan.

Somewhat later the Armenian king Artavadses wrote poems and history in Greek. When he celebrated the marriage of his sister to a son of the Parthian king Orodus (53), the feast was adorned by a performance of the "Bacchae" of Euripides in Greek. When the Bacchantes were coming with the mutilated remains of the impious king Pentheus, the messenger who arrived to announce the Roman defeat at Carrhae threw the head of Crassus on the stage. The actor who played Agave put the Roman head on his thyrsus, and the performers sang the verses of Euripides: "From the mountains to the palace, we bring the new cut tendril, blessed prey" ⁽⁸¹⁾.

The cities, not the kings, hellenized the East. It is the fashion today to denounce the nearsighted Aristotle: he failed to see the wave of the future—monarchy. When Philip was called saviour, when Alexander seized Persia, Aristotle wrote on the *polis*. After the tumult died, men learned that the monarchy was only a superstructure: the Seleucids, Antigonids, Arsacids were only passing figures; the *polis* remained. The most important result of Alexander's conquest was the introduction of Greek *polis* life in the Orient.

City-like agglomerations existed, of course, in pre-Greek Iran. Susa was a center before Athens. In the north, Merv and Samarkand were founded c. 500 ⁽⁸²⁾. At the beginning of the fourth century, Ctesias imagined that even in olden times Bactria had been full of big towns. His mythical king Oxyarthes of Bactria calls all men of military age to war and sends them back to their own cities after victory ⁽⁸³⁾.

Soviet excavations have shown that the Greeks meant walled villages when referring to "a thousand cities of Bactria". (The Greek village usually lacked fortifications) ⁽⁸⁴⁾. The low earthworks or even imposing walls (of pressed clay) with numerous towers were often refuges for men and cattle ⁽⁸⁵⁾. The thick defensive walls sometimes contained corridor-like chambers, with a large open area in the centre of the site for herds ⁽⁸⁶⁾. A tribal village with

(81) J. and L. ROBERT, no. 255 (1954), no. 345 (1956); PLUT., *Crass.*, 33.

(82) V. A. SCHISKIN, *Istoria Materialnoi Kultury Uzbekov*, IV (1963), p. 14; M. DIAKONOFF, «Sovietskaia Archeologia», XIX (1954), p. 122; PUGACHENKOVA, p. 39 ff. (Merv); p. 60 (Nysa).

(83) DIOD., II.6.2; JUST., XLI.1.8: illud mille urbium Bactrianarum imperium. Cf. *ibid.*, XLI.4.5.

(84) ARR., IV.2.3. Cf. G. A. PUGACHENKOVA, «VDI», no. 2 (1952), p. 215.

(85) Alexander's historians often write of such refuges.

(86) M. M. DIAKONOV, «MIA», XXXVII (1953), pp. 258-65. Cf. S. P. TOLSTOV, *По Следам Древней Хорезмской Цивилизации* (1948), p. 93.

the chieftain's castle in the middle was another well known type of walled settlement ⁽⁸⁷⁾.

Neither a city-refuge, nor the citadel of a tribal chieftain and feudal baron, nor a fortress and market town was a *polis*: a self-governing community of free, landowning citizens equal before the law. But Laodicea (Niha-vend), some 100 km. south of Ecbatana (Hamadan), was governed by "the magistrates and the people", though the city also had a royal prefect ⁽⁸⁸⁾. The Greek city in Media had the same organization as the Greek cities in Syria. We do not know how Laodicea and other Greek cities in Iran were founded, how the land was assigned to the colonists, how the settlers were chosen. Nor do we know what happened to the natives when, for instance, Seleucia was planted in Susa and Ecbatana became Epiphaneia.

The autocratic kings had a big stake in the success of the free cities under their sway. The Seleucid could depend on the *polis*, even if it were no military colony: the existence of the Greek *polis* among the naturally hostile natives depended on royal might. A *polis* dominated a more or less extended tract of territory. This facilitated the work of the central administration. It dealt with the *polis* regarding taxation, military aid etc., not with a medley of sheiks, villages, and landlords on the city's territory. Last but not least, the existence of autonomous *poleis* balanced the powers of the satraps.

Accordingly, the Seleucids often granted self-government to native peoples and dynasts. From c. 280 a Persian family reigned at Istahar (near Persepolis). These rulers represent themselves, on the obverse of their coins, standing before the Fire temple, with a hand raised in adoration, and seem to call themselves "Keeper of the Fire", if the legend (in Aramaic script) on these coins is rightly deciphered. It is remarkable that these princes issued silver tetradrachmas, a right generally reserved for the Seleucid overlord. But the legend in Aramaic (not Greek) made these pieces unsuitable for circulation as coins of the realm; outside Persepolis they would be treated as bullion ⁽⁸⁹⁾. Obviously the court of Antioch may have chosen to overlook

(87) V. M. MASSON, *Drevnezemledelcheskaia Kultura Margiany*, «MIA», LXXIII (1959), p. 160; he refers to ARR., IV.21.7. Cf. PUGACHENKOVA, p. 29; TOLSTOV, p. 156.

(88) ROBERT, VII, p. 7.

(89) NEWELL, p. 106. Four coins of these princes—from E. Herzfeld's collection—have been published in the *Mail Bid Sale Catalogue* no. 3 of «Edward Gans» (March 25, 1947). A relief in Persepolis is supposed to represent one of these rulers: L. VANDEN BERGHE, p. 46. On the title of these princes read as *prtrak* or *pridr* cf. HENNING, *op. cit.*, p. 25; FREY, *op. cit.*, pp. 195, 271; SCHMITT, p. 47. R. STIEHL ap. F. ALTHEIM, «Geschichte der Hunnen», I (1959), pp. 375 ff. places the dynasts of Persepolis in the II B.C. But she assumes these rulers were independent of the Seleucids. Yet STRABO, XVI.736, clearly states the Persians now have kings who are subjects of other kings, first of Macedonia and now of Parthia. Since she does not know of Herzfeld's pieces, she decides the first ruler (Bagdat) referred, on his coins, only to his priestly dignity, whereas his two successors mentioned *pr(s) br(t)* (Persepolis). Actually, Bagdat also says of himself on Herzfeld's coin: *Bgd br (p)r(t)dr zy (t)hy* (according to Herzfeld's reading). Thus all the far fetched theories of R. STIEHL have no factual basis; this often happens in the works of F. ALTHEIM and his collaborators.

these invalid coins⁽⁹⁰⁾. Until our own day the lords of the mountains near Fars (Persia) often defied the Shah, who preferred, as far as possible, to be accomadating so that he might avoid an expensive and troublesome military campaign; these well armed tribes might be used by the central government on some other occasion.

The Seleucid government changed Oriental towns into Greek *polis* whenever it seemed advisable; this weakened the traditional power of the tribal chiefs. Polybius notes that Ecbatana, esidence of Media's satrap, was still a native settlement at the end of the third century. Antiochus IV, c. 166, made Ecbatana a *polis* called Epiphaneia⁽⁹¹⁾. This transformation, however, meant the introduction of Greek constitutional machinery and the Greek language etc. The Seleucids at times used a simplified approach: they grafted some *polis* institutions on the traditional structure of an Oriental town. Thus cuneiform documents show that some towns of Seleucid Babylonia (Babylon, Cuthah, Erech), had "assemblies" (somehow linked with the temples) which deliberated (or at least recorded deliberations) in the Accadian language, had its own officers, and some Greeks among their members⁽⁹²⁾.

For the first time in cuneiform documents, a decree of the popular assembly is drafted in the Greek style⁽⁹³⁾. This document of 127 and the decree of the Jewish people honoring the Maccabean Simeon in 140 are remarkable testimonies to the influence of Greek political institutions in the Orient. According to the Seleucid law, a parcel of royal land could not become royal property unless attached to the territory of a *polis*. In this respect, Babylonian self-governing communities were assimilated to the *polis*⁽⁹⁴⁾.

We do not know whether such *polis*-like native communities existed in Seleucid Iran. It is curious, however, that according to Chinese reports there

It is noteworthy that 15 coins of later princes (I c. A.D.) in this dynasty, but none of Seleucid dynasts, have been found during excavations of Persepolis: G. C. MILES, *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* 143 (1959). No Persepolis coins have been found in the hoard buried at the acropolis of Pasagardae under Seleucus I: D. STRONACH, «Iran», II (1964), p. 38.

(90) Cf. the tetradrachmas, with a Himyarite legend, issued before 144 by an Arabian potentate: R. DUSSAUD, *Mélanges F. Cumont* (1936), I, 142.

(91) Ecbatana was called Epiphaneia (STEPH. BYZ., s.v. *Agbatana*). Therefore scholars unanimously assume the Greek city was founded by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. PLINY (n. h., VI. 14. 43) says, however: *Ecbatana caput Mediae Seleucus rex condidit*.

(92) G. Ch. SARKISYAN, «VDI», no. 1 (1952), pp. 68 ff.; no. 1 (1953), pp. 59 ff.; «EOS», XLVIII 2 (1956), pp. 29 ff.

(93) E. UNGER, *Babylon die Heilige Stadt* (1931), p. 319; I Macc. 13.

(94) G. Ch. SARKISYAN, «VDI», no. 1 (1953), p. 63. Cf. *IS*, 183. A. G. BOKSHANIN, *Parthia i Rim* (1960), p. 141, generously affirms I made "an inference which is perfectly right from the point of view of the marxist-leninist methodology", when I said there was no private property in the royal territory. (Actually, I repeated Rostovtzeff's theory). He also says that I wrongly called the peasant population (*laoi*) serfs. I expressly said (*IS*, p. 176) the *laoi* were not serfs, but *vici adscripti*.

were town in Ferghana—in the former Bactrian kingdom—where the Notables (and not the prince) decided on war and peace, and so on ⁽⁹⁵⁾.

Greeks also lived outside the self-governing *poleis*. There were numerous "settlements" (*katoikiai*) on the "territory" (*χώρα*) of the king ⁽⁹⁶⁾. For instance, we hear of Thracians "from the upper settlements" (satrapies), of *katoikoi* in Persia proper, of Greek "inhabitants" of a Bahrein island, and so on. In a walled native town called Syrinx by the Greeks, in Hyrcania, besieged by Antiochus III, Parthian troops murdered "the Hellenes in the city". In Parthian Kurdistan, in the first century B.C., documents were still written in Greek ⁽⁹⁷⁾.

But life in the *χώρα* of Iran, the immense "territory" governed directly by the Seleucid administration, remains virtually unknown ⁽⁹⁸⁾. The unwieldy satrapies of the Achaemenids were divided into smaller units ⁽⁹⁹⁾, then subdivided into "sub-governments" (*hyparchiai*). The village was the smallest administrative unit ⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. Parthian documents from Kurdistan, Dura-Europos and Nysa, compared with data of the Achaemenid administration, show—as we might expect—that some institutions—certain taxes, for example—were inherited by the Parthian kings from the Achaemenids: these institutions apparently prevailed under the Seleucids ⁽¹⁰¹⁾.

It would be dangerous to infer the same thing about the structure of the society. The hereditary grandees of Parthia paralleled the princely houses

(95) This information is given in the famous Chinese report of Jang Kien (end of the II century B.C.). Cf. F. HIRTH, « Journ. Americ. Oriental Society », XXXVII (1917), pp. 109, 112, 113, 115. The Chinese term which Hirth renders as "Notables" has also been translated as "Nobles" and "Elders". Cf. W. M. MCGOVERN, *The Early Empire of Central Asia* (1939), p. 151; J. A. ZADNEPROVSKI, *Drevnezemel'delnaia Kultura Fergany*, « MIA », 118 (1963), p. 189. Further cf. Shiratori, in *Memoirs of the Toyo Bunko* (Tokyo, 1956) and Miyazaki, *Studia Asiatica* (1962). Prof. Luciano Petech (Rome) kindly referred me to these publications.

(96) On *katoikiai* in Iran cf. TARN, 9 ff. Cf. my *JS*, pp. 78 ff. On the Seleucid *chora* cf. *JS*, p. 184.

(97) DIOD., XIX.27.5; POLYAEN., VII.39; POL., X.31.11. The Kurdistan documents: E. H. MINNS, « JHS », XXXV (1915), pp. 22 ff.

(98) Cf. *JS*, pp. 172 ff.

(99) APPIAN, *Syr*, 62, writes there were 72 satrapies in the Seleucid Empire. But the figure has the same esoteric value as the number 72 constellations, 72 parts of the world etc. Cf. F. JACOBY's, *Commentary on Ephoros*, 70 fr. 237.

BENGTSON (II, 143 ff.) maintains all provincial governors received the title *strategos*, lost financial and, probably, judicial power under Antiochus III. But his theory cannot be proved; as for the titles, it is directly refuted by the inscription Bengtson himself quotes.

(100) Cf. *JS*, p. 181. P. DURA, 20 (121 A.D.) ἐν Παλίσγει κώμῃ τῆς περὶ Ἰάρδον ὑπαρχείας. The ostraca from Nysa show that in Parthia proper, the (walled) village headed by a *dizpat* was the fundamental unit. Cf. I. M. DIAKONOV and V. A. LIVSHIZ, *Dokumenty iz Nisy* (1960), p. 22. When fully published, these ostraca—about 2000—will provide important information on the Parthian royal economy.

(101) The Persian term *paribayk* (DINON, *ap. Athen.*, XI.503 = 690 fr. 4 Jacoby) regarding food deliveries to the court reappears as *ptbayk* in the ostraca of Nysa: DIAKONOV and LIVSHIZ, *ibid.*, p. 18.

of the Achaemenids. But neither Alexander nor his successors in Asia wore the tiara and the long Median robes of the Achaemenids and the Arsacids. The dignitaries of the Seleucids were mere creatures of the Crown. The Parthian magnate led a body of well armed retainers in the war for his liege overlord. The Seleucid army was royal. Greek *katoikia*i and Greek inhabitants of the *chora* limited the power and influence of Iranian barons.

One day new finds will throw light on this fascinating chapter of social history, and show how the Seleucids could stabilize their dominion in Iran; though individual barons maintained social position, the baronial class no longer had military power and political influence.

Iran and Syria were two heartlands of the Seleucid Empire ⁽¹⁰²⁾. The Seleucids lost both, first Iran, then Syria by family strife and dynastic wars, by Roman intervention: *facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus* ⁽¹⁰³⁾. Seleucid princes and generals, not native chiefs, dismembered the Empire. As late as 141 Demetrius II, deprived of Syria by the rebellious general Tryphon, could hope to regain Syria with the help of Iran ⁽¹⁰⁴⁾.

The Hellenes in *poleis* and settlements preserved their identity and lived more or less apart from the natives. Livy, translating Polybius, writes on the Hellenes in Seleucid Asia Minor: *nec terra mutavit genus aut mores*. After two centuries under Parthian rule, Seleucia on the Tigris, Pliny observes, was *libera hodie ac sui iuris Macedonumque moris* ⁽¹⁰⁵⁾.

The transmission of the Greek spirit and civilization in the East was primarily the task of the school: the *gymnasium*. Toward the middle of the third century, Greek "inhabitants of Ikadion", on a Bahrein island, also had a *gymnasion* and exercised in the hardly bearable humid heat of the Persian gulf ⁽¹⁰⁶⁾. As the Greek word shows, the Greek "gymnastic" demanded complete nudity. This custom, abhorrent to the "Barbarians", Romans, Jews, Persians, and so on, separated the Greeks more effectively than any color bar, without giving offence. The *gymnasion* and, thus, Greek society did not exclude Orientals, but disgusted them; a Hellenized native admitted into the *gymnasium* was uprooted, lost to his ancestral race.

Moreover, language divided Greeks and natives. Local dialects were not written in Iran; Aramaic was the language of writing. The Greeks probably learned only some everyday words of the local dialect: Susa stood on the river called "Ulai" in Aramaic, and the Greeks confused the word with the Macedonian name "Eulaeus" ⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. In Susa (and Dura-Europos) Greeks colonists still gave their children Macedonian (or Greek) names.

(102) STRABO (XI.515, 531) calls the Seleucids "Kings of Syria and Media".

(103) JUST., XXXVI.3.9.

(104) JOS., A., XIII.185.

(105) LIV., XXXVII.54.18; PLIN., n. h., VI.26.30.

(106) Cf. the official letter τοὺς ἐν Ικιδίων ἀρχήτας: J. and L. ROBERT, no. 819 (1961), p. 28.

(107) L. ROBERT, *Epistemonike Epeteris* (of the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Athens) 1962-63, p. 525. Cf. STRABO, XI.518.

Lost in some faraway place, the Greeks in Iran tenaciously clung to their cultural tradition; when Alexander settled colonists in Outer Iran, they abandoned their lots, wanting a Greek life and training ⁽¹⁰⁸⁾.

Greek pioneers in Iran, though isolated, were supported by the unity of Greek civilization during the Hellenistic age. Magnesia on the Maeander sent colonists to Antioch on the Persian gulf (Bushir) ⁽¹⁰⁹⁾. Antioch and other Greek cities in Iran solemnly recognized the new festival of the metropolis. The settlers on a Bahrein island not only had a *gymnasion*, but also celebrated the athletic contests frequented by sportsmen from other Greek communities; these contests were promoted by the royal government. The bee of the Artemis of Ephesus appeared on coins minted at Susa (and Erech) ⁽¹¹⁰⁾. In the farthest East, Greek inscriptions of the Indian king Asoka display the same style of lettering and writing as Greek texts in Egypt, and Greek secretaries of the Buddhist ruler wrote perfect Greek, with the Greek philosophical vocabulary ⁽¹¹¹⁾. Alexandria Margiana (Merv), finally, was built on the Hippodomean city plan ⁽¹¹²⁾.

Greek and Iranian law systems remained separate, according to the language in which the instrument was drawn. Greek notaries and Aramaic scribes employed their own legal style ⁽¹¹³⁾. The manumissions in Greek made in Susa or near the Caspian sea observe the same Greek formulary ⁽¹¹⁴⁾. Neither "Aramaic" nor "Greek" law decided the content of private acts. The wishes of the parties and legal training of the scribes determined the clauses of a contract, so long as it did not violate the positive law of the king or *polis*. But custom, the habits of the scribes limited the variety of legal concepts. Only thus may we use the convenient and conventional labels "Greek", "Oriental" law, and so on.

It is interesting to note that Seleucus I, successor of the Achaemenids, did not cite Persian custom when he married his second wife Stratonice (who had already borne him a child) to Antiochus, child of the first, Iranian marriage. Seleucus rather appealed to the universal precept: the decision of a king is always just and fair ⁽¹¹⁵⁾.

The Greeks still worshipped their own gods. Herakles—on a relief at Behistun—was Herakles Kallinikos, and the relief was dedicate by a Seleucid official ⁽¹¹⁶⁾. Some 150 km. southeast of lake Urmia, the traditional formula

(108) DIOD., XVIII.7.1: Ποθοῦντες τὴν ἐλληνικὴν ἀγωγὴν καὶ διαίταν.

(109) «OGIS», 233.

(110) ALLOTE DE FUEY, in «Mémoires de la Delegation de Perse», XXV (1932), p. 9.

(111) L. ROBERT, in «Comptes-Rendus de l'Ac. des Inscr.» (22 Mai, 1964).

(112) R. GHIRSHMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

(113) *IS*, p. 209.

(114) L. ROBERT, «Rev. de Philol.», LXII (1936), pp. 137 ff.; XI-XII (1960), p. 81.

(115) APP., *Syr.*, 61. Cf. HEROD., III.31: when Cambyzes wants to marry his sister, he is told the Persian laws allow the Persian King to do whatever he pleases.

(116) ROBERT, *supra*, n. 100, p. 525. The relief is reproduced in FRYE, *op. cit.*, pp. 69-70. Cf. the dedication to Zeus the Saviour, Poseidon, and Artemis the Saviour by "So-

of the Greek prophylactic was inscribed near the entrance to a cave: "Herakles lives here, no evil may enter" ⁽¹¹⁷⁾. The naked Herakles in the Teheran Museum is the Greek deity ⁽¹¹⁸⁾: male gods of the Orient were not shown naked. Menander, a Greek ruler in northwestern India, adopted the Athena of Macedonian Pella for his tetradrachmas ⁽¹¹⁹⁾. At the northern point of their Far East, Greek settlers or Hellenized natives in the valley of Kafirnigar, a tributary of Upper Amu-Darya, placed Charon's coin in the mouth (or on the breast) of the dead more than a century after Greek domination of Bactria ended ⁽¹²⁰⁾.

Besides the Greeks, who were polytheists, worshipped local deities—through zeal or prudence. In Susa, the goddesses Ma and Nanaia were privately revered alongside the Macedonian Apollo and Artemis Daïtai and "Phoebus of the glorious bow" ⁽¹²¹⁾. Unfortunately, the official worship of the city remains unknown.

The Greeks recognized the power of native gods and readily conceded the grandeur and antiquity of Oriental civilizations. Yet the Greeks, curious as their scholars were, never tried to learn the secret of hieroglyphs or Iran's true history. Oriental knowledge and tradition were accepted by the Greeks only when filtered through a Greek intellectual medium, adapted to the Greek taste and mental outlook. Mithra never subdued Greece because he could not speak the Greek language ⁽¹²²⁾. Amid the splendor and immensity of the East, the Greeks stubbornly clung to their classical ideal of the *kosmos*, the ordered and intelligible world: "A little *polis* living in rational order on a crag is superior to the follies of Nineveh" ⁽¹²³⁾.

Hellenism was imposed on the Iranian because the Greeks neither imitated nor repelled the natives. To a man in Susa or Ecbatana the whole rich world of the conquerors and masters—who wielded both—the spear of Alexander and the pen of Aristotle, was wide open, but at the price of complete Hellenization. Greek society did not tolerate "Greco-Iranian" or other

teles the Athenian, and the soldiers" made c. 300 on an island near Kuwait in the Persian gulf. J. and L. ROBERT, no. 190 (1944).

(117) J. and L. ROBERT, no. 227 (1946-47). Cf. TAC., *Ann.*, XII.13.

(118) FRYE, p. 71. Herakles appears on bronze coins issued at Susa and Ecbatana with regard to Seleucid victories. E. T. NEWELL, nos. 334 and 566. The popularity of Herakles at Hatra, where Aramaic was spoken, parallels his success in the Roman Empire. (Cf. S. FUKAI, «East and West», XI (1960), pp. 25-26, 166). But note that inscriptions of Hatra do not mention him.

(119) A. S. BRETT, «American Numism. Society», Notes IV (1950), 64.

(120) M. M. DIAKONOV, «MIA», XV (1950), p. 161.

(121) *SEG*, 7, 10, 11, 17, 18, 22. It is interesting to note that Nanaia is always defined as "Nanaia, a goddess". J. and L. ROBERT, no. 253 (1954), observe there is nothing "Oriental" in the hymn to Apollo composed by a certain Herodoros of Susa (*SEG*, VII.14).

(122) Cf. «Class. Phil.», XLVII (1952), pp. 65 ff. On Mithra cf. LUCIAN *Deor. coun-cil.* 9.

(123) Phocylides ap. DIO CHRYS., XXXVI.11: Πόλις ἐν σκοπέῳ κατὰ κόσμον οἰκουσα σμικρὴ κρείσσειν Νίνου ἄφραιν οὐσίης.

hyphenated Greeks. (This was the dilemma of the Jews, who had to give up monotheism or acceptance by the Greeks). Natives were lost to their original group when educated in the Greek manner. But success could be won only through acceptance of Greek civilization, or at least some of its elements.

In Iran, as we mentioned, the native languages were not written; scribes of the Parthian kings, working near the Caspian sea, had to learn Aramaic script, and these scribes mentally translated their own words into barbarized Aramaic and vice versa: during the first century B.C., the Greek school was the only source of knowledge.

Yet the Greek school was a force against native tradition. In Ptolemaic Egypt, the school list of river names to be memorized included the Eurotas of Sparta, omitting the Nile. Tamerlane falsely tracing back his pedigree to Jenghis Khan, who began his genealogy with the spirit Alongoa (Olympias, Alexander's mother)⁽¹²⁴⁾, unknowingly and faintly echoed the Greek school rooms in Iran: Greek teachers propagated Alexander's legend a millenium before the Mongol invasion. Cassandra—who looks like an Indian girl—staring at the fatal horse of Troy on an Indian relief and Laocoon with his mortal snake, found near Termez, again show how the Greek school influenced the native milieu⁽¹²⁵⁾.

We cannot judge the impact of Greek civilization in Iran proper⁽¹²⁶⁾ without systematic excavation of Hellenistic sites.

Excavations in Outer Iran, above all those on Bactria's territory, reveal the amazing extent of Hellenization throughout the Far East in the Greek world. Long after the Greek rulers were defeated, the Bactrians (in the second century A.D.) used the Greek alphabet to write the Iranian language⁽¹²⁷⁾.

Hellenistic terracottas from Merv to Samarkand, till the eighth century A.D., prove the influence of Greek art, the popularity of Greek subjects—including the hermaphrodite⁽¹²⁸⁾. The numerous figurines of the goddess which

(124) E. HERZFELD, « Islam », VI (1916), 317.

(125) M. WHEELER, *Rome Beyond the Imperial Frontiers* (Pelican book) p. 26. L. L. ALBAUM, *Balalyk-Tepe* (1960), p. 24.

(126) Cf. GHIRSHMAN, p. 18, f. 21. Cf. VANDEN BERGHE, pl. 137. VANDEN BERGHE (p. 223 and map p. 224) enumerates rare monuments of the Seleucid period found in Iran. Their date is uncertain. Some of them may have been built under the Arsacids. GHIRSHMAN, *op. cit.*, f. 116 (he assigns the monuments to the Parthian period)—Aphrodite: *ibid.*, pl. 64 d; also A. GODART, *L'art de l'Iran* (1962), p. 153. The statuettes from Nehavend: VANDEN BERGHE, *op. cit.*, pl. 116; GHIRSHMAN, *op. cit.*, f. 23. D. SCHLUMBERGER, « Syria », XXXVII (1960), 307, thinks Bactria was more Hellenized than Iran. If he is right, it would confirm our belief that effective Hellenization was the work of local rulers.

(127) A. MARICQ, « J. Asiatique » (1958), pp. 345 ff.; W. B. HENNING, « Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies » (University of London), XXIII (1960), pp. 47 ff.; E. BENEVENISTE, « J. Asiat. », CCXLIX (1961), pp. 133 ff. It is remarkable that the Choresmian alphabet, used in the III–VIII centuries, was of Aramaic origin: S. P. TOLSTOV, V. A. LIVSHIZ, « Soviet. Etnografia », no. 2. (1964), pp. 50 ff.

(128) L. REMPEL, in *Trudy of the South Turkmenian Archaeol. Expedition*, I (1949), 333, 351. On the terracottas of Samarkand cf. C. TRVER, *Terracottas from Afrasiab* (State Academy for the History of Material Culture), « Izvestia », no. 93 (1934).

appear in the third century do not continue the line of bronze age terracottas of the female deity. There is a gap of many centuries, and the goddess of the Greek age is Venus, often a young girl, not the mother ⁽¹²⁹⁾. Dionysiac themes were also popular: a clay vase found at Termez imitated a famous Greek original ⁽¹³⁰⁾. In the delta of the Syr Darya, Soviet archaeologists have found Greek terracottas, and the statue of Priapus with a cluster of grapes in one hand and a garden knife in the other ⁽¹³¹⁾. The astonishing clay statues of the dead sitting on their own ossuaries let us visualize the population of the desert region in the III-II century B.C. ⁽¹³²⁾. But the art of these statues is Greek, and "the oriental element is confined to ethnographical details" ⁽¹³³⁾. This holds true for the statues and decorations executed in the third century A.D.: five centuries after the last Greek soldiers had left the Transoxania ⁽¹³⁴⁾. Only during the V-VIII centuries do the figures in the frescoes at Balalyk-Tepe, Panjikent, and Varakhash begin to look somewhat "Oriental"—Indian or Chinese ⁽¹³⁵⁾; the wooden caryatids at Panjikent, which look like Indian dancing girl, still resemble the *korai* of the Erechtheion ⁽¹³⁶⁾.

But the finds in Nysa (ancient residence of the Parthian kings, bordering the desert and 16 km. from Ashkhabad) provide the most eloquent testimony to the charm of Greek art. The Parthian kings made exquisite marble statues representing Hera and Venus of Milo. The face of Venus indicates the model was a local girl ⁽¹³⁷⁾.

At their sumptuous feasts, the Parthian kings used ivory rhytons adorned with Dionysiac scenes. One of these shows a naked Bacchante seen from the back—an artistic and erotic motif of Hellenistic art ⁽¹³⁸⁾. Furthermore, the Parthian kings had rooms decorated with enormous male and female statues, probably of royal ancestors; these clay images must have been of local workmanship.

Perhaps even more surprising is the fact that clay stamps of seals, found

(129) M. E. MASSON, G. A. PUGACHENKOVA, «Ejehodnik Inst. Istorii Iskustva», I (1956), p. 460; G. A. PUGACHENKOVA, «Sovetskaja Archeologia», XXIX-XXX (1959), p. 121; V. M. MASSON, *Drevnezemled. Kultura Margiany*, «MIA», 73 (1959), p. 159.

(130) G. V. PUGACHENKOVA, «VDI», no. 1 (1951), p. 128 refers to ROSTOVITZ'EF's, *SEHHW*, pl. 83.

(131) TOLSTOV, p. 127 (the author calls the statue "Dionysos").

(132) TOLSTOV, p. 132; Y. A. RAPPOPORT, *Trudy*, pp. 127 ff.

(133) I quote ROSTOVITZ'EF («AJA», XLVI [1942], p. 300) on the monuments published in K. V. TREVER, *Pamiatniki Greko-Baktriskovo Iskustva* (1940). He also notes (p. 300) the rugs from Noin-Ula in Mongolia were decorated in the Greek manner.

(134) Cf. A. L. MONGAIT, *Archaeology in the U.S.S.R.* (Pelican book) (1961), p. 239 ff. Cf. also the golden statuette published by K. V. TREVER, in «Trudy of the Ermitage», II (1958), p. 130.

(135) Cf. MONGAIT, *op. cit.*, pp. 249 ff.; L. ALBAUM, *Balalyk-Tepe* (1960).

(136) V. L. VORONINA, in *Trudy*, p. 117.

(137) M. E. MASSON and G. A. PUGACHENKOVA, *Ejehodnik Instituta Istorii Iskustva* (1956), pp. 460 ff. Cf. GHIRSHMAN, pp. 29 ff.

(138) M. E. MASSON and G. A. PUGACHENKOVA, *Parfianskie Ritony Nisy* (1956).

at Nysa, have images of Greek gods, Athena, Erotes etc., and images from Greek fable, such as the Centaurs. The Greek Victory, with a crown and a palm in the hand, was especially favored. The seals were not simply copied from Greek originals: the horse which often accompanies Nike gives a local flavor to the Greek ideal ⁽¹³⁹⁾.

Yet the ostraca of the accounting office, found at Nysa, are written in Aramaic, and all persons (about 200) named in these texts bear Iranian, and half theophoric names ⁽¹⁴⁰⁾.

Some of the works which pleased the Parthian king may have been done by Greek artists. One of them, Antioch, son of Dryas, signed the bust of a Parthian princess ⁽¹⁴¹⁾. But for the historian, the taste of patrons is more important than the nationality of the artist.

In learned discussion frontality denotes Parthian art ⁽¹⁴²⁾, the art form of nomads from Outer Iran ⁽¹⁴³⁾. Frontality, in fact, is a natural position when a person or static group poses for a painter or photographer. Roman spouses on funerary reliefs, Celtic gods ⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ as well as gods and men of Iran are portrayed looking directly at the spectator. A relief at Tang i Sarawak (southeast Iran) shows a ruler sitting and rows of his courtiers standing, all seen from the front, solem and immobile—as if they were posing before a photo camera at the beginning of our century. But the cavalier charging lion appears in profile on the same relief ⁽¹⁴⁵⁾. This too is natural. Persons (and animals) in action do not gaze at bystanders.

Yet there are narrative paintings and reliefs, for example, the well-known sacrificial scenes at Dura-Europos, where the figures—engaged in common action—stare immobilized at the temple visitors ⁽¹⁴⁶⁾. What did frontality mean to the people who commanded images, to Adadiabos, son of Zabdiol? Adadiabos was portrayed offering a libation and incense to the statue of the god Aphlad ⁽¹⁴⁷⁾. This man stands before the idol, and both god dedicant

(139) V. M. MASSON, «VDI», no. 1 (1953), p. 152.

(140) I. M. DIAKONOV, V. A. LIVSCHIZ, in *Sbornik, honoring I. A. Orbeli* (1960), p. 301.

(141) A. GODART, *L'Art de l'Iran* (1962), p. 96.

(142) Cf. essentially M. I. ROSTOVITZEFF, *Dura and the Problem of Parthian Art*, «Yale Classical Studies», V (1935), pp. 157–304; E. WILL, *Le Relief Culturel Greco-Romain* (1955), pp. 219 ff. D. SCHLUMBERGER, «Syria», XXXVII (1960), 131 ff.; 253 ff.; E. WILL, «Syria», XXXIX (1962), 45 ff.

(143) GHIRSHMAN, (1962), p. 7. Ossuaries from Sogdiana and Choresmia rather show men in profile. Cf. e.g. A. A. POPTAPOV, «VDI», no. 2 (3) (1938), p. 215; V. M. JAGODIN, «Soviet. Etnografia», no. 4 (1963), p. 94.

(144) Cf. e.g. H. SCHOPPA, *Die Kunst der Römerzeit in Gallien* (1957), pl. 40; 74; 82.

(145) FRYE, pl. 75–76. W. B. HENNING, «Asia Minor», II (1952), pp. 151 ff.; these reliefs were done in the second half of the II century A.D.

(146) Cf. e.g. the sacrifice to Jarhibol (ROSTOVITZEFF, *op. cit.*, f. 57) and of Canon (ROSTOVITZEFF, *SEHHW*, pl. 97).

(147) ROSTOVITZEFF, *SEHHW*, pl. 57. H. SEYRIG, «JRS», XL (1950), p. 4 has already stressed the fact that the rule of frontality destroys "all the dramatic sense of the picture and prefers to emphasize the spiritual presence of each individual figure".

glare at the spectator, who may wonder if the fragrant grains dropped by this stony devotee would not miss the censer. Frontality emphasized not ritual action, but intent: Adadiabos wants to be near his god. Sacrifice is almost a pretext whereby the onlooker may value Adadiabos as a man of true faith: "Hath the Lord as great delight in burntofferings and sacrifices as in hearkening to the voice of the Lord? Behold to obey is better than sacrifice and to hearken than the fat of rams?" (I Sam. 15:22).

Absolute frontality as a new art form emerges not in Iran, but Upper Mesopotamia (Dura-Europos), probably during the first century A.D.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾. Evidence for absolute frontality is late and rare⁽¹⁴⁹⁾. While the bourgeoisie in their Mesopotamian cities favored the egalitarian device of frontality, the Arsacids and their *grandees* still preferred the classic Greek style⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ during the first and second centuries A.D.; the oversized clay statues of men and women in palace halls at Nysa, the frescoes of a palace at Kuh i Khwaja (Seistan) reveal this.

We may now conclude: the Seleucid regime did not, and could not, change the permanent forms of life in Iran. These were conditioned by geography and determined, till our day, by the traditional structure⁽¹⁵¹⁾. The Greek *poleis* remained small enclaves, with no future, on the immense plateau of Iran, and the spirit of the *polis* hardly moved the surrounding tribes.

The people of Antioch gave the Seleuci and Antiochi funny names: "the aquiline nose" (*Grypos*), just as the people of Naples called Ferdinand II "Nasone". It is difficult to imagine humor at the expense of the Arsacids. A Seleucid invited his courtiers and visitors to the table. The Parthian king, who called himself "Philhellene" took meals alone and from time to time threw scraps of food, "as if it were to a dog", to his "friend" squattered on the ground at the king's feet. The "friend" was scourged at the caprice of his lord, then prostrated himself before the royal benefactor⁽¹⁵²⁾. The Greeks at Susa manumitted their slaves by dedicating them to some god on behalf of the Seleucid sovereign and his family⁽¹⁵³⁾. Every visitor entering

(148) SCHLUMBERGER, *op. cit.*, pp. 264 ff.; no. 3 p. 134 and 269.

(149) As far as I know, the only frontal narrative representation from Iran is the relief where Artabanus V gives a crown to an official. It is a poorly executed provincial work. VANDEN BERGHE, *f.* 106.

(150) M. E. MASSON and G. A. PUGACHENKOVA, «Ezhegodnik Instituta Istorii Iskustva», I (1956), pp. 463 ff.; PUGACHENKOVA, pp. 85 ff.; E. HERZFELD, *Iran in the Ancient Near East* (1941), p. 294 and pl. 101 ff. I must add, however, that neither the restorations (and dating) of the building at Nysa nor the dating of the palace at Kuh i Khwaja are as secure as the authors quoted pretend.

(151) 85 % of Iran's territory is used as pasture. M. P. PETROV, *Iran* (in Russian) (1955), p. 138. As late as 1912, a French adviser to the Shah suggested the division of Persia proper (Fars) into regions and sub-regions governed by the chieftains of local nomadic tribes. M. S. IVANOV, *Plemena Farsa* (1961), p. 124.

(152) POSEID., *ap. Athen.*, IV.152 f. = 87 fr. 5 Jacoby. Cf. C. B. WELLES, *Yale Class. Stud.* (1935), p. 126 n. 1.

(153) The consecration of a slave *pro salute* of a monarch (or somebody else) does not occur in Greek manumissions, but is attested in Mesopotamia during the Old Babylonian

Parthian Babylon had to do obeisance before the golden image of the king ⁽¹⁵⁴⁾.

The Greeks, as we mentioned, were not easily influenced by Iranian thought. Still they began to wear Persian dress ⁽¹⁵⁵⁾ at Dura-Europos and probably also in Iran, under the Parthian regime.

It is significant that Zoroaster was always somewhat nebulous for the Greeks. They ascribed all sorts of apocryphal deeds to him; both he and his disciples, Ostanes and Hystaspes, were considered Hellenized magi ⁽¹⁵⁶⁾. It seems the Iranian clergy also paid little attention to the Greeks. Though oracles attributed to Hystaspes predicted the revenge of the East on the West at the end of time, the West was Rome.

In Zoroastrian tradition Alexander, who destroyed the Avesta, is damned. But this "accursed Alexander" is Roman. The story was probably invented under the Sassanids. In another legend, Alexander defeated his younger, unworthy half-brother Darius and regained the Persian throne ⁽¹⁵⁸⁾.

The Persian historical view stressed legitimacy ⁽¹⁵⁹⁾. Cyrus, who conquered Media, Lydia, and Babylonia, was called the heir (nephew, descendant) of the kings he dethroned. Cambyses was a son-in-law (or grandson) of the Pharaoh Apries and avenged him by subduing Egypt. The first Sassanid married the daughter of the last Arsacid, and Husein, Mohammed's grandson, married the daughter of the last Sassanian king ⁽¹⁶⁰⁾.

Hellenistic Greeks thought personal virtù shown in victory legitimated the founder of a new dynasty ⁽¹⁶¹⁾.

The effects of Hellenization were long delayed. A smattering of English and some skill in the use of machine guns today opens the gates of the United Nations to barbarians. But Greek civilization was not technical. Rather it was humanistic and demanded a change of heart. As Philo the Jew wrote: Greece alone can be truly said to produce human beings ⁽¹⁶²⁾.

and Assyrian periods. P. KOSCHAKER, *Ueber Einige Griechische Rechtsurkunden* (« Abhandl. Saechs. Akad. », XLII.1; 1931), p. 75.

(154) PHILOSTR., V. *Apoll.*, I.27.

(155) Thus the Phoenician aristocracy wore Persian robes, under Achaemenid rule. H. SEYRIG, « Antiq. Syriennes », II (1938), p. 48. On materials imitating the garments trimmed with pearls, cf. H. SEYRIG, « JRS », XL (1950), p. 3; AL'BAUM, p. 182; G. A. KOSCHENKO, « VDI », no. 3 (1962), p. 171. The Greek tradition at Dura, however, was ended not by Parthian occupation, but through the establishment of the Roman garrison at the beginning of the third century. C. B. WELLES, *Aegyptus* (1959), p. 27.

(156) J. BIDZ, F. CUMONT, *Les Mages Hellenisés* (1938).

(157) BIDEZ-CUMONT, *op. cit.*, pp. 217 ff.

(158) E. G. BROWNE, « Literary History of Persia », I (1908), pp. 119 ff. Cf. H. S. NYBERG, *Die Religionen des Alten Irans* (1938), p. 465; J. GAGÉ, *La Montée des Sassanides* (1964), p. 67.

(159) G. GOOSENS, in « Sacra Pagina », I (1959), p. 248 = *Bibliotheca Theologic. Lovanensium*, XII.

(160) GAGÉ, *op. cit.*, p. 232; BROWNE, *op. cit.*, p. 130.

(161) *IS*, p. 14.

(162) PHILO, *do provid.*, 66.

On the other hand, neither Iranians nor other peoples of the classical Near East were barbarians. The Iranians may have lacked an adequate alphabet, but their minstrels, like the Homeridae of Greece, preserved oral culture ⁽¹⁶³⁾. Iran was the equipoise of Rome. When the pious Justinian forbade the teaching of philosophy in Athens (529), the philosophers found refuge at the Sassanian court; Khushro I ordered the translation of Plato and Aristotle ⁽¹⁶⁴⁾.

Hence the Iranians had to filter Greek thought through the medium of their own mentality. This took time, but Time is *il galante uomo*, and Truth is the daughter of Time. True culture cannot be transmitted in bottles and tubes and taken rapidly and painlessly like pills. For learning, as Aristotle says, is a painful process ⁽¹⁶⁵⁾.

Anacharsis, seduced by Greek civilization, and "Hypasimus, son of Mitroaxos, Bactrian", who made dedications to Apollo of Delos ⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ in 180 B.C., were curiosities. Yet Hellenization bore fruit when, in the beginning of the third century A.D., the Parthian palace at Babylon was decorated with tapestries depicting, side by side, episodes from Greek mythology—especially the story of Orpheus. There were also scenes of Persian victories over the Greeks in the war which seems like an unbroken succession of Greek triumphs to the reader of Herodotus ⁽¹⁶⁷⁾.

Hellenization showed its beneficial force when Antiochus I of Commagene—he died between 38–31 B.C.—spoke of his "most felicitous" origin. (He was a descendent, through his father, of a Bactrian lord and an Achaemenid princess, and a Seleucid by maternal descent.) For Antiochus I was both Persian and Hellene, a descendant of Darius and Seleucus Nicator. Antiochus I worshipped Ormuzd, protector of the Achaemenids—regarding the protector also as Zeus—and Mithra, identified with Apollo, the ancestral god of the Seleucids. Antiochus I hoped that after his death his spirit would mount to the celestial throne of Zeus Oromasdes ⁽¹⁶⁸⁾.

A millenium later the Iranian renaissance brought forth men like Al-Biruni, Alfarabi, and Avicenna. Moslem heirs of Greek Bactria, students and commentators of Plato and Aristotle—absorbed Greek ideas, made the borrowing creative, and became teachers of Europe ⁽¹⁶⁹⁾. Biruni in his Chronology

(163) M. BOYCE, « JRS » (1957), p. 10 ff.

(164) E. ZELLER, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, III 2 (5th ed. 1923), p. 915.

(165) ARIST., *Pol.*, V. 1339.

(166) ROSTOVITZ, *SEHW*, III no. 124 (1942).

(167) PHILOST., *V. Apoll.*, 1.25.

(168) L. JALABERT, R. MOUTERDE, « Inscriptions... de la Syrie », I no. 1–36 (1929). Cf. M. C. PIDELLO, in « Annali delle Facoltà di Lettere... dell'Università di Cagliari », XXII (1953), pp. 9 ff. H. Doerrie, *Die Koenigskult des Antiochos von Kommagene* (Abh. Goetting. Akad. 3 F. no. 60; 1964) 189 ff.

(169) Byzantine astronomers sometimes used translations of Persian astronomical works and used Persian and Arabic technical terms. Cf. O. NEUGEBAUER, *Studies in Byzantine Astronomical Terminology*, « Proceedings of the Amer. Philosophical Society », N. S. L, 2 (1960).

used Greek tools and created something worthy of Scaliger. Biruni completed his work c. 1000 A.D., when the Occident awaited the apocalyptical "Year 1000". As Marc Bloch notes, the fear that gripped Europe at the end of the tenth century was mitigated by the common ignorance of chronology and the reckoning of time⁽¹⁷⁰⁾. If, in suicidal folly, we should bomb our civilization out of existence, would the light be kept burning by our students in Iran?

ABBREVIATIONS.

- BENGTSON = BENGTSON H., *Die Strategie in der Hellenistischen Zeit*. 3 Vols. 1937-1952.
 FRYE = FRYE R. N., *The Heritage of Persia*. 1963.
 GHIRSHMAN = GHIRSHMAN R., *Persian Art: The Parthians and Sassanids*. 1962.
 IS = BICKERMAN E., *Institutions des Séleucides*. 1937.
 J. and L. ROBERT = « Bulletin Epigraphique » (Revue des Études Grecques).
 « MIA » = « Materialy i Izsledovania po Archeologii USSE ».
 « NNM » = « Numismatic Notes and Monographs ».
 NEWELL = E. T., *Eastern Seleucid Mints*. 1938.
 PUGACHENKOVA = PUGACHENKOVA G. A., *Puti Razvitiia Architecture Turkmenistana* (1958)
Trudy of the South Turkmenian Archaeol. Exped., Vol. VI.
 ROBERT = ROBERT L., *Hellenica* I-XII. 1940-1960.
 ROSTOVITZEFF, SEHHW = ROSTOVITZEFF M., *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 1941.
 SEG = *Supplem. Epigr. Graecum*.
 SCHMITT = SCHMITT, HATTO H., *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen* (1964),
 « Historia, Einzelschriften », 6.
 TARN = TARN W. W., *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. 1938.
 TOLSTOV = TOLSTOV S. P., *Po Dreemim Deltam Oksa i Jakarta*. 1962.
Trudy = Trudy of the XXVth Internat. Congress of Orientalists, III. Moscow. 1963.
 VANDEN BERGHE = VANDEN BERGHE L., *Archéologie de l'Iran Ancien*. 1959.
 « VDI » = « Vestnik Drevnei Istorii ».

Intervento sulla relazione del prof. Bickerman.

GAFUROV. — Ringrazio per l'ottima relazione. C'è qualcuno che vuol prendere la parola? Vorrei soltanto aggiungere che il prof. Bickerman ha notato con molta opportunità e molto giustamente quello che ci è stato portato di nuovo dagli studiosi sovietici in questo campo. Mi congratulo con il prof. Bickerman.

(170) M. BLOCH, « La Société Féodale », I (1939), p. 136.